

1  
2  
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
4 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
5 OAKLAND DIVISION  
6

7 JORGE PINEDA, an individual, TITA  
8 GUZMAN, an individual,

9 Plaintiffs,

10 vs.

11 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN  
12 FRANCISCO, and DOES 1 through 100,  
inclusive,

13 Defendants.  
14

Case No: C 11-0457 SBA

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO  
SHORTEN TIME**

Docket 24.

15 On January 25, 2012, Defendant City and County of San Francisco (“Defendant”)  
16 filed a motion to exclude Plaintiffs’ experts from testifying at trial. Dkt. 26. Also on  
17 January 25, 2012, Defendant filed an administrative motion to shorten time, requesting that  
18 a hearing on its motion to exclude be set for February 7, 2012 or February 14, 2012. Dkt.  
19 24. Plaintiffs did not file a response to the motion to shorten time. Having read and  
20 considered the papers filed in connection with this matter and being fully informed, the  
21 Court hereby GRANTS the motion to shorten time.


22 This Court may grant a motion to shorten time where the moving party identifies  
23 “the substantial harm or prejudice that would occur if the Court did not change the time.”  
24 Civ. L. R. 6-3(a)(3). Defendant argues that the motion to shorten time should be granted  
25 because unless the motion to exclude is heard sufficiently before the expert cut-off date of  
26 February 24, 2012, Defendant will have to expend public resources to conduct 15  
27 depositions before the Court has an opportunity to decide whether the Plaintiffs’ experts  
28 should be excluded from testifying at trial. The Court has reviewed the motion to shorten

---

1 time, the motion to exclude, and the materials filed in support thereof, and finds that  
2 Defendant has identified substantial harm or prejudice that would occur if the Court  
3 ordered the parties to follow the normal schedule, and therefore GRANTS the motion to  
4 shorten time. Accordingly, the Court orders as follows. Plaintiffs shall file an opposition  
5 to Defendant's motion to exclude by no later than February 8, 2012. A reply shall be filed  
6 by no later than February 10, 2012. The opposition shall not exceed ten (10) pages, and the  
7 reply shall not exceed five (5) pages. Upon the filing of the reply, the matter will be taken  
8 under submission without oral argument. This Order terminates Docket 24.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: 2/2/12

  
11 SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG  
12 United States District Judge  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28